



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,960	07/24/2001	Ola Olofsson	TPP 30887CIP2	4841

7590 09/24/2003

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
Suite 850
1615 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

FLANDRO, RYAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3679

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/910,960

Applicant(s)

OLOFSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan M Flandro

Art Unit

3679

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3620

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's amendment raises issues requiring further search and/or consideration and does not place the application in better form for appeal. First, Applicant's additional limitations regarding the structure of the "cavities" does not overcome the structure shown in Martensson as discussed in the Final Rejection (paper no. 12, page 7). Second, the limitations added to "clarify the positions and locations of the first and second fitting clearances" requires further search and/or consideration. Third, Applicant's argument that Martensson does not form a first and second fitting clearance is not persuasive and Applicant is directed again to the final rejection (paper no. 12) for the Examiner's stance on how Martensson does in fact contain such clearances. Fourth, Applicant's argument that Martensson and Parasin cannot be properly combined is, again, not found to be persuasive since Parasin is merely cited to show that the use of glue in connecting tongue and groove joints is well known in the art. Martensson is asserted to contain each of the remaining limitations and, therefore, the fact that Parasin discloses a different structure is irrelevant. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Here, Parasin merely suggests that glue may be applied and held within any recesses provided on the joint. Lastly, recitation of the cavities having a cross-section closed on all sides creates 112-2nd paragraph issues of indefiniteness because it is unclear from the claim language how the joint is being cut to view such cross-section.